UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,300	01/20/2006	Masaaki Tanizaki	ASAM.0183	7090
<sup>38327</sup> <b>Juan Carlos A</b> . I	7590 07/08/201 <b>Marquez</b>	EXAMINER		
c/o Stites & Har	rbison PLLC	TANG, SIGMUND N		
1199 North Fair Suite 900	riax Street	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, VA	22314-1437	2612		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/08/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/565,300	TANIZAKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SIGMUND TANG	2612		

	SIGMUND TANG	2612	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIANE STATES.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS  3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, because the context of the context o	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		•
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:</li> </ul>	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	•	_
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> <li>M The request for reconsideration has been considered but</li> </ol>		•	
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (  13. Other:		and name	
/BENJAMIN C. LEE/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612			

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

## Application No.

Continuation of 11. The applicant argues that the limitation of "wherein the number of objects (or occupied area ratio) displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities" is not met. The examiner disagrees because:

A.) The priorities are addressed in Moroto, US Patent No. 5.121.326 (Figure 3).

B.) The applicant's specification explains the limitation of "number of objects or occupied area ratio" by use of an example "50 roads (or maximum of 30% in occupied area ratio" [0047]. Nakayama, US Patent No. 5,732,385 is the reference used for providing the concept of using a vehicle's speed in combination with a number of objects (occupied area ratio) wherein Nakayama states, "...the higher the vehicle speed is, the broader will be the road map range; or the lower the vehicle speed is, the narrower will be the road map range, so that the \*\*more detail\*\* road map near the current vehicle position can be displayed at low vehicle speed."

Nakyama meets the limitation about having more detail (number of objects) and a narrower road map (occupied area ratio) at a low vehicle speed (changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle).

The prior art combination as established in the rejection changes the number of objects or occupied area ratio depending on vehicle speed, and furthermore, using priority since the change is made with regard to whether or not the objects/road/occupied area portions are part of the route or around the current location of the vehicle, i.e. wherein priority is given to those that are. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not deemed persuave, and the rejection stands.